



John T. Aubberger
Supervisor

TOWN OF GREECE

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES **MARCH 3, 2010**

THE MEETING BEGAN AT 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT

Alvin I. Fisher, Jr., Chairman
Alfred S. Ancello
Christine R. Burke
Stephen M. Savage
William E. Selke
Michael H. Sofia
Christopher A. Schiano, Deputy Town Attorney
Scott R. Copey, Clerk of the Planning Board
John Gauthier, P.E., Associate Engineer
Linda R. Lamb, Planning Board Secretary

ABSENT

Grace L. Plouffe

ADDITIONS, DELETIONS AND CONTINUANCES
TO THE AGENDA

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Development Services Training 3/17 at 5:30 pm

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
MARCH 3, 2010

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Old Business

None

New Business

1. Applicant: Kenneth Brongo

Location: 3106 Ridgeway Avenue
Request: Preliminary and final plat approval for the subdivision of a 2.844 acre parcel into two single-family residential lots (2.166 acres and 0.677 acres) with existing utilities
Zoning District: R1-18 (Single-Family Residential)
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 088.03-1-5.1

The following is a synopsis of the discussion pertaining to the above-referenced request.

Bernard Schmieder, Engineer and Land Surveyor, and Kenneth Brongo presented the application.

Mr. Schmieder: Mr. Brongo lives on the north side of Ridgeway Avenue, adjacent to the Erie Canal, east of Manitou Road, shown as Lot 1 on the map. At this time, Mr. Brongo is looking to create a new Lot 2 at the western property end. There is public water service to the site. The sewage disposal will be by a separate septic system that has been reviewed by the Monroe County Health Department (MCHD). Storm water drainage for this site will not be modified. The land has a slight slope toward canal. A shed exists in the rear of the proposed new lot and Mr. Brongo has agreed to remove the shed from Lot 2.

Mr. Copey: The subdivision was reviewed by the Monroe County Development Review Committee (MCDRC). Their comments related to the highway access and utilities within the right-of-way. MCDRC forwarded the project on to the New York State Canal Corporation for review. The Canal Corporation indicated that the applicant has to remove the shed that is partially on canal land. The Canal Corporation also expressed some concern regarding the septic system on Lot 1. You will have to prove to them that the existing septic system and its location are approved. The Canal Corporation further indicated that if the new residents on Lot 2 wished to build a dock, they would have to apply to them for a permit. The Town's Environmental Board reviewed the plans and commented about setback from the canal, replacing trees removed from Canal Corporation property, and ensuring adequate filtration for the septic system due to its proximity to the canal. There were no other significant staff comments. Are we set with the shed issue?

Mr. Brongo: I plan to pull the shed over to my lot.

Mr. Copey: The shed may not be permitted to be placed on Lot 1. With the R1-18 (Single-Family, Residential) zoning, you would be over the percentage allowed for lot coverage with all the accessory structures you have on the property.

Mr. Brongo: The property is grandfathered as IG (General Industrial). I can keep all the structures on my lot. I've been working with Gary Tajkowski, Director of Development Services, on this for the past four years. These are preexisting, non-conforming structures and may remain. They are used for my construction business and this condition goes with the land when I sell it. When the Town Board approved the re-zoning, this was clearly written up in the resolution.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
MARCH 3, 2010

Mr. Copey: Did you talk about the use staying in place after you actively subdivided the property and built a home?

Mr. Schiano: How have you been using the land?

Mr. Brongo: I am a contractor and it has been used for the storage for my equipment. My plan has been to move it to my property; however, if the shed is going to become an issue, it can go away. I will remove it.

Mr. Copey: An approval condition can have a back door in it. If the Building Department allows it, it can stay. There is another issue relating to the storage container located to the east of the existing accessory structure on Lot 1; that has to be removed.

Mr. Brongo: I don't know why. This is my construction trailer and I am allowed to retain it.

Mr. Copey: Permanent witness posts should be installed at the property corners to identify private property versus the State of New York property. These posts should be visible above the ground.

Mr. Schneider: Does the Town have a detail on the posts?

Mr. Gauthier: We try to do this when public land is adjoining wetland. The developer is allowed to put in something to his liking. We don't have a Town standard.

Mr. Brongo: Can you provide me some addresses where I can look at these?

Mr. Copey: We have some examples and can provide them to you. Mr. Brongo removed some trees from Canal Corporation land.

Mr. Brongo: I did remove trees. I received three tickets, went to court, and was fined. Every tree that came off the property was scrub or was snapped off by the ice storm. Any tree of value is still there. I don't want to plant trees. I like it the way it is. I mow it and get lots of compliments. I have to pay the Canal Corporation money annually to mow their land. I don't want to put a buffer there.

Mr. Fisher: One of our goals as part of the Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP), is to keep the canal property in its natural state. This is done partly for wildlife and to provide a buffer between the canal and adjacent areas. When you take trees down, or mow the area, it is counter to what we have committed to do as part of the LWRP. We want a buffer there. The trees may not have been perfect, but they were what naturally grows up along the canal.

Mr. Sofia: Can you show me where the trees were removed on the map? Were they the whole length of the property? Do you actually have to pay the Canal Corporation to cut the grass?

Mr. Brongo: Here's where they were removed; it was not the entire length of the property. They were partially on my property and partially on Canal Corporation property. Yes, I pay them, and they require a certificate of insurance on file at all times. They have that and I paid \$7,000 for it.

Mr. Sofia: It is interesting. We, the Town, prefer the buffering, yet the Canal Corporation is allowing him to maintain and charges him to do it.

Mr. Fisher: When the LWRP is fully implemented, all the agencies — town, county, state, federal — will have to abide by the document.

Mr. Brongo: I understand what you are saying. Just go to the area and walk the canal to my house. You will see 55-gallon drums, tires; that's what I cleaned up.

Mr. Selke: Last year this Board took a boat ride along the canal. We went by your property and it was very noticeable that the buffer was missing. There were also some runoff ruts

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
MARCH 3, 2010

visible. Along the rest of the canal, it was like we weren't in a community. It was in its natural state. That is why the LWRP is put in place. There is a change of the canal environment when you get to your site.

Mr. Brongo: My neighbors also mow to the canal and always have. I am trying to blend in with them. Across the canal, the State goes in with a large mower and just mows down everything as far as you can see. They leave the debris laying in the bike path and canal.

Mr. Fisher: We would like you to replace the vegetation you removed.

Mr. Sofia: I struggle with the fact that he is paying to mow the area.

Mr. Copey: The Canal Corporation doesn't care about buffering or aesthetics. They come along and mow down the grass, as you stated. They are a permitting agency that maintains a structure. They don't care about fluffy stuff. It is the Planning Board that wants you to do the buffering. Part of the reason you that should do this is to buffer what you want to retain — the preexisting structures. I don't think we want to see those types of things from the canal.

Mr. Fisher: Because of all the hassle you have been through with the Canal Corporation, the simplest thing would be to do some planting on your site. You could do it in the area where the trees were removed.

Mr. Selke: We can't allow him to plant on Canal Corporation property. I understand that you like the view, but we are looking for a little compromise here.

Mr. Copey: Do you intend to sell Lot 2?

Mr. Brongo: Yes, my father is interested.

Mr. Sofia: Would you be willing to do as Bill requested?

Mr. Brongo: With the location of my home, the barn, the leach field, I don't have a lot to work with. My intentions are to remain on this property and leave it to my children. They like it there.

Mr. Schmeider: Does the Board have an idea of what they would like to see there?

Mr. Selke: I'm also concerned about Lot 2. I'd like to see some buffering there as well.

Mr. Fisher: We aren't trying to totally buffer the site, but we are trying to provide some break so it isn't one large open area.

Mr. Copey: I'll take a walk on the canal path. I'll probably ask John Plummer from the town's Department of Development Services to recommend some species for planting.

Mr. Schiano: This property is zoned R1-18. He has been allowed to have this pre-existing, non-conforming situation but he isn't allowed to have any other general industrial use on the property. If you were to stop using the property in the manner you have been using it, you will lose that pre-existing, non-conforming right. That would take place after a period of six months. I just want to make sure you are clear that you can't do anything more with the land than what you are doing now.

Mr. Brongo: They can do on the land what I am doing now. I understand.

Mr. Schiano: The zoning changed but they allowed the use to continue.

Mr. Brongo: I am willing to sit down and talk about what you want me to do with buffering on my lot.

Mr. Selke: I think it's just as important to buffer Lot 2; that's a pretty bare site. On Lot 1, you have a property line that goes through a gravel driveway.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
MARCH 3, 2010

Mr. Brongo: I own that entire driveway. When I purchased the property, I gave them personal use until their death.

Mr. Sofia: I agree that the buffering on Lot 2 is important. It doesn't have to be 100% blockage of the view. You don't have to put the trees on a berm. Just some spruce or something, maybe 20 to 30 feet apart.

Mr. Fisher: How many trees do we want to consider?

Mr. Copey: You should have at least 30 feet between plantings to allow for their size at maturity.

Mr. Schmeider: Are you thinking hardwood? Austrian pine would be a good choice because they keep their branches to the bottom. Throw in a few blue spruce and Douglas fir to make a nice buffer.

Mr. Brongo: Are you talking in a row?

Mr. Sofia: Spread them out, 20 feet off the property line. Seven trees per lot would be adequate.

Mr. Copey: On the residential lot, I'd break it up and add some deciduous trees.

Mr. Schmeider: We can do conifers behind the industrial lot and a mixture behind the residential lot.

Mr. Copey: We have landscape standard minimums of 5-foot-tall conifers and 3 1/2-inch caliper deciduous trees upon planting.

Motion by Mr. Sofia, seconded by Mr. Selke:

WHEREAS, Kenneth Brongo (the "Applicant") has submitted a proposal to the Town of Greece Planning Board (the "Planning Board") for approval of preliminary and final plat, as more fully described in the minutes of this public meeting (the "Proposal"), relative to property located at 3106 Ridgeway Avenue (the "Premises"); and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board makes the following findings:

1. Upon review of the Proposal, the Planning Board determined that the Proposal is subject to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York State Environmental Conservation Law, Article 8) and its implementing regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617 *et seq.*, the "SEQRA Regulations") (collectively, "SEQRA"), and that the Proposal constitutes an Unlisted action.
2. The Planning Board has considered the Proposal at a public meeting (the "Meeting") in the Greece Town Hall, 1 Vince Tofany Boulevard, at which time all persons and organizations in interest were heard.
3. Documentary, testimonial, and other evidence were presented at the Meeting relative to the Proposal for the Planning Board's consideration.
4. The Planning Board carefully has considered an Environmental Assessment Form and supplementary information prepared by the Applicant and the Applicant's representatives, including but not limited to supplemental maps, drawings, descriptions, analyses, reports, and reviews (collectively, the "Environmental Analysis").
5. The Planning Board carefully has considered additional information and comments that resulted from telephone conversations, meetings, or written correspondence from or with the Applicant and the Applicant's representatives.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

MARCH 3, 2010

6. The Planning Board carefully has considered information, recommendations, and comments that resulted from telephone conversations, meetings, or written correspondence from or with various involved and interested agencies, including but not limited to the Monroe County Department of Planning and Development, the Monroe County Department of Environmental Services, the Town of Greece Environmental Board, and the Town's own staff.
7. The Planning Board carefully has considered information, recommendations, and comments that resulted from telephone conversations, meetings, or written correspondence from or with nearby property owners, and all other comments submitted to the Planning Board as of this date.
8. The Environmental Analysis examined the relevant issues associated with the Proposal.
9. The Planning Board has met the procedural and substantive requirements of SEQRA.
10. The Planning Board carefully has considered each and every criterion for determining the potential significance of the Proposal upon the environment, as set forth in SEQRA.
11. The Planning Board carefully has considered (that is, has taken the required "hard look" at) the Proposal and the relevant environmental impacts, facts, and conclusions disclosed in the Environmental Analysis.
12. The Planning Board concurs with the information and conclusions contained in the Environmental Analysis.
13. The Planning Board has made a careful, independent review of the Proposal and the Planning Board's determination is rational and supported by substantial evidence, as set forth herein.
14. To the maximum extent practicable, potential adverse environmental effects revealed in the environmental review process will be minimized or avoided by the incorporation of mitigation measures that were identified as practicable.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that, pursuant to SEQRA, based on the aforementioned information, documentation, testimony, and findings, and after examining the relevant issues, the Planning Board's own initial concerns, and all relevant issues raised and recommendations offered by involved and interested agencies and the Town's own staff, the Planning Board determines that the Proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, which constitutes a negative declaration.

VOTE:	Ancello	- yes	Savage	- yes
	Burke	- yes	Selke	- yes
	Plouffe	- absent	Sofia	- yes
			Fisher	- yes

MOTION CARRIED
SEQRA DETERMINATION
NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
MARCH 3, 2010

Mr. Sofia then made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Selke, to approve the Proposal, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall develop the Premises in conformity with all details of the Proposal as presented in the written descriptions and site development plans, as orally presented to the Planning Board, and as set forth herein. In the event of any conflict among the oral or written descriptions of the proposal, the site development plans of the proposal, or the requirements or restrictions of this resolution, the Applicant agrees that the Planning Board shall determine the resolution of such dispute.
2. The existing shed located partially on Lot 2 and partially on adjacent lands owned by the State of New York shall be removed entirely from the Premises unless otherwise permitted by the Building Inspector to remain temporarily on Lot 2 until a Principal Structure is placed, erected or constructed on Lot 2. Pursuant to the limitations on the total allowable gross floor area of accessory structures in Table I of the Zoning Ordinance, said shed shall not be placed on Lot 1 unless otherwise permitted by the Building Inspector. No approval signatures shall be placed on the subdivision plat unless and until the shed has been removed from lands owned by the State of New York.
3. Pursuant to §211-25(C), the storage container located to the east of the existing accessory structure on Lot 1 shall be removed entirely from the Premises unless otherwise permitted by the Building Inspector.
4. Permanent witness posts shall be installed at the property for Lots 1 and 2 corners where the Lots 1 and 2 adjoin lands owned by the State of New York. The details and installation methods shall be included on the subdivision plat, shall be subject to approval by Town staff prior to signing the subdivision plat, and shall at a minimum be visible aboveground and indicate in writing New York State's ownership of adjoining lands.
5. The Applicant shall verify Monroe County Health Department approval of the existing leach field on Lot #1.
6. The Applicant shall work with Town staff to identify and provide coniferous and deciduous landscaping for both Lots 1 and 2. As offered and agreed by the Applicant, seven (7) coniferous trees shall be added to the rear of Lot 1, placed so that they buffer the preexisting, non-conforming storage use, and seven (7) trees (a mix of deciduous and coniferous) shall be added to the rear of Lot 2. Said trees shall be sized in accordance with the town's Landscape Guidelines for Development, and the species and location of such trees shall be subject to approval by the Planning Board Clerk.
7. A dated signature of the owner/developer shall be added to the plat.
8. The Town's *2001 Community Master Plan Update* (Clough, Harbour & Associates, September 2001) contains current and projected population growth; an inventory and analysis of public, private, and semi-private recreation facilities, both active and passive; and recommendations for future actions. Based on this document, the Planning Board finds that the Town currently needs, or will need, additional park and recreation space in the vicinity of the Proposal. The Planning Board further finds that development of this subdivision will contribute to the demand for additional park and recreation space, and that this subdivision provides no suitable park or recreation land to address such current or future need. Therefore, pursuant to New York State Town Law, Section 277, payment of the Town's recreation fee shall be required for each building lot in this subdivision, payable to the Town upon the issuance of the

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

MARCH 3, 2010

original building permit for each house. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plat.

9. No building permits shall be issued for any of the lots in this subdivision unless and until this final plat has been recorded in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk. The Liber and Page at which this final plat is recorded in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk shall be indicated on the approved, signed copies of this final plat that are submitted to the Town.
10. No building permits shall be issued for any of the lots in this subdivision unless and until a digital copy of the plans has been submitted. All sheets in the drawing set, with all necessary signatures and the Liber and Page at which this final plat is recorded in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk, shall be provided in Tagged Image File (".TIF") format at a minimum resolution of 400 dpi.
11. Subject to approval by the Town's Chief Engineer and Commissioner of Public Works.
12. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include successors and assigns.
13. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include successors and assigns.
14. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific law, ordinance, code, rule, or regulation, it shall be construed to include any succeeding or superseding authority.

VOTE:	Ancello	- yes	Savage	- yes
	Burke	- yes	Selke	- yes
	Plouffe	- absent	Sofia	- yes
			Fisher	- yes

MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION APPROVED
WITH CONDITIONS

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
MARCH 3, 2010

SITE PLAN REVIEW

Old Business

1. Applicant: Benderson Development Company, LLC

Location: 3188-3196 Latta Road (near northwest corner of Latta Road and Long Pond Road)

Request: Site plan approval for a proposed retail/restaurant plaza (54,322± square feet), with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on approximately 9.487 acres

Zoning District: BR (Business Restricted)

Mon. Co. Tax No.: 045.03-1-9 and -10

Motion by Ms. Burke, seconded by Mr. Ancello, to continue this application until the March 17, 2010, Planning Board meeting, as requested by the applicant.

VOTE:	Ancello	- yes	Savage	- yes
	Burke	- yes	Selke	- yes
	Plouffe	- absent	Sofia	- yes
			Fisher	- yes

MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION CONTINUED
UNTIL MARCH 17, 2010, MEETING

New Business

None

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
MARCH 3, 2010

CONCEPT PLAN

1. Applicant: Bayfront Venture, LLC

Location: 700 Pond View Heights (generally northeast of the intersection of the Lake Ontario State Parkway and Long Pond Road)

Request: Concept plan review of a proposed expansion of an existing apartment development, consisting of 77 townhouse units in 21 buildings, with related paved parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on approximately 10.5 acres

Zoning District: RMH (Multiple-Family Residential)

Mon. Co. Tax No.: 034.01-1-2.1, -2.2

The following is a synopsis of the discussion pertaining to the above-referenced request:

John Caruso, P.E., Passero Associates; Jeff Sudol, Passero Associates; and Mark Stevens, S.B. Ashley Management Corporation, presented the application.

Mr. Caruso: We have brought with us some architectural elevations to share with you. We are here to obtain the Board's feedback on this proposed project. In the spring of 2008, S.B. Ashley acquired this parcel, which included Phase 1, the existing Long Pond Shores apartments. Phase 1 includes 256 units on 23 acres of land. The land purchase also included a 10-acre vacant parcel, which is what we are here to discuss tonight, Phase 2. The initial focus was to rehabilitate the existing apartment project, both interior and exterior. Those changes included new siding, covered entrances, windows, energy improvements, dumpster enclosures. The existing community center was rehabilitated and a new pool was installed. S.B. Ashley has spent just under \$2,000,000 on renovations. As they obtained their vision for the community, they started to plan for the additional 10 acres, Phase 2. It was determined that we needed more than a two-dimensional flat plan. We obtained a full topographic survey of the site. One of the elements for the new product was terraced views of Long Pond. The elevation is 10 ft. higher at the road than at the shoreline. Today there is a loading ramp and dock which is the only opening to view the pond. We looked at the vegetation, did a wetland delineation, and hired a biologist for a tree survey, who placed a value on each tree. There are many cottonwood trees. With westerly winds, you can image it makes a real mess throughout Long Pond Shores. Our intention is to maintain the trees of value and those that assist in preventing shoreline erosion. We then needed to develop a building that worked in the environment and position them into the parcel. The buildings will have garages for storage. There will not be basements due to the high water table. The roadway will connect with the existing road in two places and we have added a new, northern exit from the project. This will assist in balancing the traffic load. The Grove House Restaurant is to the north and the Lake Ontario State Parkway is to the south. At least 90% of the cars leaving the complex will go south onto the Parkway. We are taking advantage of, and improving, the existing infrastructure. There is a water main, and now that we have this expansion we can have a second water main in the project. The sanitary sewer goes to a pump station. There will be landscaping, with each building having its own foundation plantings. We will be providing lighting throughout the area for security, a community mailbox area, and visitor parking throughout the new phase. The town's zoning ordinance calls for 1.75 parking spaces per dwelling unit; we will have 2.5 parking spaces per unit. The driveways will be 25 feet long. An amenity that we have added is a trail system that connects to the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) parcel to the southwest. We have included passive

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
MARCH 3, 2010

recreation with park benches, picnic areas, and a gazebo down near the water. The last recreational improvement will be the loading dock for boat launch. The current one will be replaced with a new concrete slab. The overall density of the project will be 9.9 dwelling units per acre, with Phase 1 at 10 units per acre and Phase 2 at 7 units per acre. This is under the multiple-family zoning limit of 10 units per acre. The density decreases as you move north in the project. We will maintain the buffer to the north. We don't intend to obtain NYSDEC permits except for storm water management, where we will be using some alternative techniques. We already have begun discussions with the Town's Department of Public Works (DPW). There will be duplex and quadruplex units. They have been designed to have a pleasing architecture front and rear with patios and a privacy wall, creating a pleasant view from the water.

Mr. Fisher: I think that it is appropriate to make this a public hearing. We have that option to provide additional notification to folks in the area. There will be interest to those that are not immediate neighbors.

Mr. Selke: These are rentals? Will you be using the existing clubhouse and pool for Phase 2? Will there be basements? Will they have one-car or two-car garages? You mentioned that you feel that the parking provided is adequate. How many parking spaces will you have in Phase 2? Your design is both ranch and townhouse? Will the building design and colors be uniform? I like the idea of the new entrance; that will help. Will there be boat storage on-site?

Mr. Caruso: The units in Phase 2 will be rentals, with no basements, and one-car garages. The Community Center and pool are for all residents on the site. The design will be uniform, as shown here, but colors will vary. When we come in for preliminary site plan approval, we will share the materials and colors. Mr. Stevens does not want to entertain boat storage on-site.

Mr. Selke: You mentioned improvements to the existing apartments. Are you through with that? I mention this because I ran into several huge potholes on the site. Is dumpster storage marked on here?

Mr. Caruso: The improvements done in Phase 1 will continue and part of that was new dumpster enclosures. The townhouses in Phase 1, as well as all of Phase 2, will use garbage totes picked up by a refuse hauler on a regular schedule, just like what is done for single-family homes.

Mr. Selke: Why does the new trail not go to the waterfront?

Mr. Caruso: We don't want people walking behind the residences of those paying higher rent along the water.

Mr. Ancello: What will the pricing be?

Mr. Caruso: On average, \$1400 per month.

Mr. Fisher: I think that we should consider making some area, immediately adjacent to the water, more natural. It will buffer and assist in keeping the wild geese from coming in. They will love coming onshore and eating the grass and will leave a mess behind.

Mr. Caruso: We really do want to keep the shoreline natural. Our plan is to clean up bramble and ice storm mess.

Mr. Fisher: You mentioned lighting.

Mr. Caruso: We want to place 14-foot-high, colonial-style, 150-watt high-pressure sodium post lighting throughout the project for safety.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
MARCH 3, 2010

Mr. Fisher: Another issue is sidewalk. We will have to make that determination. Normally, sidewalks would be required along the property frontage. I think that this is the first project that we have had adjacent to a distressed waterway since the regulations changed. There may be issues related to capturing and treating the runoff. You may be required to use non-phosphorous fertilizers.

Mr. Gauthier: The cost of doing the work may be less than the maintenance and operational aspects. We need to satisfy DEC requirements.

Mr. Caruso: It has been recognized that this project is unique. We are treading new ground as well, so we look forward to working together on this. Enhancing Long Pond is to our advantage as well.

Mr. Selke: Who are you trying to attract to these units?

Mr. Caruso: Empty-nesters, young professionals. The price range is such that we don't look to a lot of families. However, with some three-bedroom units, families are a possibility.

Mr. Selke: There are a lot of families currently living in Phase 1. Where do the children get picked up for school?

Mr. Caruso: There is a gazebo out on Long Pond where the children are picked up by the school buses.

Mr. Fisher: The north entrance and the Grove House entrance are right next to each other. Is it possible to combine those?

Mr. Copey: I suppose that it is possible. It would be unusual to combine a residential and commercial entrance. The proximity of the two curb cuts will have to be dealt with by the Monroe County Department of Transportation (MCDOT).

Mr. Gauthier: The volume coming out of the Grove House is going to have peaks and valleys. I think that the residents will learn the best time to use the entrance.

Mr. Fisher: There is a Town sanitary sewer pump station near the northwest corner of this site. It looks like a driveway for that goes into this property.

Mr. Caruso: Yes, there are easements for that.

Mr. Copey: To play up what John said, I want to commend them for coming in early and considering the Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP). One of the things that we discussed was the internal trail. There are public walkways to the south and public land to the east. I wonder whether it doesn't make sense to facilitate some of those connections. One other thing was the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) for this project. The nature of the waterway, we may want to consider a coordinated review.

REVIEW COMPLETE

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
MARCH 3, 2010

SPECIAL PLANNING TOPIC

1. Applicant: Eastwest Energy Corporation

Location: 1315 Maiden Lane

Request: Minor improvement plan approval for the proposed renovation of an existing gasoline dispensing station (1,500± square feet) to incorporate a convenience store (200± square feet) within the existing building

Zoning District: BR (Restricted Business)

Mon. Co. Tax No.: 074.07-8-5

The following is a synopsis of the discussion pertaining to the above-referenced request:

Philip LePore, Shajan Baby, Owner, and Mike Wall of FRA Engineering presented the application.

Mr. LePore: We are here to request approval for the minor improvement plan. We were before you on November 5 to discuss issues relating to the site, specifically traffic and the curb cuts on Maiden Lane and Fetzner Road. We are reducing the width of both curb cuts. We received a letter from the town's Department of Public Works (DPW) indicating that they were okay with the curb cuts. The Monroe County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) did review the plans and requested some minor revisions to those curb cuts. We did increase the green space on the property from 25% to 26%. We are installing a 6-foot-high, 32-foot-long privacy fence on the west side of the property to buffer Pine Valley apartments from this site. The special use permit and all the necessary variances have been granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. Copey: Because this is a minor improvement plan, it was not reviewed by the Monroe County Development Review Committee (MCDRC). We did have it reviewed by the MCDOT. The applicant has been working with us as early, and as often as possible. Minor comments from staff. We have comments from the Fire Marshal on the nature of the water line and the requirement to sprinkler the building. We want to make sure that the plans are subject to approval by the DPW and the Fire Marshal. It is a definite improvement to the site. I would like the Board to provide input on the dumpster enclosure.

Mr. Selke: There is a new sign out front that doesn't look like it has been painted correctly. There is black sticking out of the white.

Mr. Baby: The sign is not new. We obtained a permit from the Town. The sign is not final yet; there will be more information added to the sign. When the weather improves, we will be painting the pole black.

Mr. Selke: That is what I wanted to hear. How about striping for the lanes in and out and for the parking?

Mr. LePore: Yes, we will be providing striping but first wanted recommendations from the Board.

Mr. Copey: The curb cut widths have been reduced considerably. This is a small site and a truck will be tight pulling in.

Mr. Gauthier: Striping will provide direction to drivers, but they will come over the lines.

Mr. Selke: Will you be adding landscaping?

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
MARCH 3, 2010

Mr. LePore: We will be adding plants and shrubs to the areas near the curb cuts.

Mr. Selke: I suggest adding some planters with flowers to the site. It doesn't cost a lot and does a lot for the appearance.

Mr. LePore: That is a good suggestion.

Mr. Fisher: The current location of the dumpster at the rear of the building appears to be the only practical location.

Mr. LePore: Yes, it is enclosed with brick that matches the building; it is 6 feet in height.

Mr. Savage: What about snow storage?

Mr. LePore: The locations are identified on the drawing.

Mr. Wall: This is a tight site and it is likely that arrangements will be made to remove the snow from the site.

Mr. Copey: Did we finalize the dumpster enclosure?

Mr. Sofia: It's better facing the eastward toward the Police Station and shopping center than the apartments. It is enclosed nicely.

Motion by Mr. Ancello, seconded by Mr. Selke:

WHEREAS, Eastwest Energy Corporation (the "Applicant") has submitted a proposal to the Town of Greece Planning Board (the "Planning Board") for approval of a minor improvement plan, as more fully described in the minutes of this public meeting (the "Proposal"), relative to property located at 1315 Maiden Lane (the "Premises"); and

WHEREAS, having considered carefully all relevant documentary, testimonial, and other evidence submitted, the Planning Board makes the following findings:

1. According to Article 8 (State Environmental Quality Review Act) of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law and 6 NYCRR Part 617 *et seq.*, the implementing regulations therefor (the "SEQRA Regulations"), this proposal is classified as a Type II action (See § 617.5) of the SEQRA Regulations).
2. According to the SEQRA Regulations, Type II actions have been determined to not have a significant adverse impact on the environment and are not subject to further review under the SEQRA Regulations.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that, based on the aforementioned information, documentation, testimony, and findings, the SEQRA Regulations do not require further action relative to this proposal; and be it further

RESOLVED that, the Planning Board approve the proposal with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall develop the Premises in conformity with all details of the Proposal as presented in the written descriptions and site development plans, as orally presented to the Planning Board, and as set forth herein. In the event of any conflict among the oral or written descriptions of the proposal, the site development plans of the proposal, or the requirements or restrictions of this resolution, the Applicant agrees that the Planning Board shall determine the resolution of such dispute.
2. A dated signature of the owner/developer shall be added to the plan.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

MARCH 3, 2010

3. Lines for the approval signatures of the Commissioner of Public Works, Fire Marshal, and Chief Engineer shall be added to the plans.
4. The landscaping on the Premises shall be maintained by the current owner of the Premises, and by any future owner. The owner of the Premises shall replace any dead plants with the same species or a similar species. The replacement plant shall be no smaller than the previous plant when it originally was installed. A note that indicates these requirements shall be added to the plan.
5. As offered and agreed by the Applicant, the Applicant shall provide pavement markings within the Fetzner Road and Maiden Lane accesses which will separate the entrance lane from the exit lane.
6. Snow storage areas shall be shown on the site plan.
7. Subject to approval by the Town's Fire Marshal, Chief Engineer, and Commissioner of Public Works.
8. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include any successors and assigns.
9. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include successors and assigns.
10. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific law, ordinance, code, rule, or regulation, it shall be construed to include any succeeding or superseding authority.
11. The applicant shall modify plans to show pavement striping for parking and entrance and exit lanes for both curb cuts.

VOTE:	Ancello	- yes	Savage	- yes
	Burke	- yes	Selke	- yes
	Plouffe	- absent	Sofia	- yes
			Fisher	- yes

MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION APPROVED
WITH CONDITIONS

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
MARCH 3, 2010

2. Applicant: Carmen Renna

Location: 75 Beatty Road

Request: One 90-day extension of the August 5, 2009, minor subdivision approval to subdivide an existing 1.7-acre parcel into two lots and to create an out-of-district sanitary sewer for the two-lot subdivision that would pump into the existing Janes Road sanitary sewer

Zoning District: R1-44 (Single-Family Residential)

Mon. Co. Tax No.: 035.04-1-3

The following is a synopsis of the discussion pertaining to the above-referenced request:

Mr. Fisher: We talked about this before the meeting and it sounds as though the delay was related to the extraordinary circumstances surrounding the sanitary sewer and not the fault of the applicant.

Ms. Burke then made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Savage, to grant one 90-day extension, as requested by the applicant.

VOTE:	Ancello	- yes	Savage	- yes
	Burke	- yes	Selke	- yes
	Plouffe	- absent	Sofia	- yes
			Fisher	- yes

MOTION CARRIED
ONE 90-DAY
EXTENSION GRANTED

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
MARCH 3, 2010

3. Applicant: Monroe County Department of Transportation

Location: Round Pond outlet at Edgemere Drive (between 666 Edgemere Drive and 672 Edgemere Drive)

Request: Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP) consistency review for the 2010 outlet bridge construction at Edgemere Drive and Round Pond

Zoning District: PL (Public Land)

Mon. Co. Tax No.: 035.03-1-7

Mr. Copey: There is an informational meeting going on across the hall on this project right now. It is a Monroe County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) capital project to replace the Edgemere Drive bridge over the Round Pond outlet. The County needs permits from New York State Department of Environmental Conservation and New York State Department of Transportation. The MCDOT has requested the Planning Board make a Local Waterfront Revitalization Plan (LWRP) determination.

Mr. Savage made a motion, seconded by Mr. Sofia

WHEREAS, the Monroe County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) will undertake a project to replace the Edgemere Drive bridge over the Round Pond outlet into Lake Ontario; and

WHEREAS, the MCDOT has requested that the Planning Board make a recommendation on the Determination of Consistency, pursuant to the Town's Local Waterfront Revitalization Program; and

WHEREAS, the Code of the Town of Greece, New York, §208-4 (Waterfront Consistency Review Law), authorizes the Planning Board of the Town of Greece to review and make recommendations to appropriate agencies regarding the consistency of proposed actions with the Town of Greece Local Waterfront Revitalization Program policies and standards; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board makes the following findings:

1. The Planning Board finds that the proposal will advance the following policies and standards, described in greater detail in the Town of Greece Local Waterfront Revitalization Program ("LWRP"):
 - a. Revitalize the deteriorated and underutilized waterfront areas of the Town of Greece
 - b. Ensure that development occurs where adequate public infrastructure is available
 - c. Minimize flooding and erosion hazards
 - d. Safeguard economic, social, and environmental interests in coastal areas
 - e. Maintain adequate public access to the shoreline

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

MARCH 3, 2010

NOW, THEREFORE be it

RESOLVED that the Planning Board finds the Proposal to be consistent with the Town of Greece Local Waterfront Revitalization Program policy standards and conditions and, in accordance with the Code of the Town of Greece, §208-(5)(H), hereby recommends that the approving agency render a Determination of Consistency.

VOTE:	Ancello	- yes	Savage	- yes
	Burke	- yes	Selke	- yes
	Plouffe	- absent	Sofia	- yes
			Fisher	- yes

MOTION CARRIED

LWRP DETERMINATION MADE

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
MARCH 3, 2010

CODE COMPLIANCE

APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Motion by Mr. Sofia, seconded by Mr. Savage, to approve the minutes of the February 17, 2010, Planning Board Meeting.

VOTE:	Ancello	- abstain	Savage	- yes
	Burke	- yes	Selke	- yes
	Plouffe	- absent	Sofia	- yes
			Fisher	- yes

MOTION CARRIED
FEBRUARY 17, 2010
MINUTES APPROVED

ADJOURNMENT: 9:00 p.m.

Signed: _____

Date: _____